DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 258 VT 007 565

Personnel Policies Forum. Survey No. 83; Effective Utilization of Manpower.
Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Aug 68
Note-24p.
Available from-Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1231 25th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037 ($2.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Communication (Thought Transfer), Employer Attitudes, Employer Employee Relationship, *Employment Level, *Employment Practices, Goal Orientation, Industry, Labor Unions, Management, Manpower Development, *Manpower Needs, *Manpower Utilization, National Surveys, *Personnel Policy

The purpose of this study was to discover what private companies are doing in the field of manpower utilization. Aspects of the subject covered by this survey are manpower audit, motivation, temporary help, handling of job changes, and the union's effect on manpower utilization. Sixty-five percent of the participating companies employ 1,000 or more employees. It was found that 86 percent of the companies communicate company goals to employees, and 76 percent report that they take steps to identify individual employee's goals. More than one-fourth report some experience in tailoring a job to fit an employee's talents. More than half of the companies have some plan for coordinating staffing requirements so that surplus manpower in one area can be loaned to other areas with shortages. Of those companies that have compared the efficiency of regular employees on overtime with the efficiency of temporary employees, 45 percent say that the regular employees are more efficient, while 30 percent found the reverse to be true. Topics covered by the report include Manpower Analysis, Achieving Effective Utilization of Manpower, Manpower Shortages, and Problems in Accomplishing Proper Utilization of Manpower. (CH)

ED 028258

AUGUST
1968

SURVEY NO.
83

EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Personnel Policies Forum®

VT007565

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY BUR. OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

BNA

THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Copyright © 1968 by The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.

What Is The Personnel Policies Forum?

The Editors of The Bureau of National Affairs have invited representative personnel and industrial relations executives to become members of the 1967-68 Panel of the PERSONNEL POLICIES FORUM. These Panel members are top personnel officials in all types of companies, large and small, in all branches of industry and all sections of the country.

At regular intervals throughout the year BNA editors ask the members of the Panel to outline their policies and procedures on some important aspect of employment, industrial relations, and personnel problems. From these replies, the editors complete a survey report on the problem, showing prevailing practices, new wrinkles and ideas, and cross-section opinion from these top-ranking executives.

In many cases, the comments, suggestions, and discussions are reproduced in the words of the Panel members themselves. In effect, survey users are sitting around a table with these executives and getting their advice and experience on the major problems in this field facing all companies this year.

Results of each PERSONNEL POLICIES FORUM survey made during 1967-68 are printed in a special survey report which is sent, as part of the service, to users of these BNA labor reports:

Labor Relations Reporter; Labor Policy and Practice; Daily Labor Report; White Collar Report; Retail Labor Report; and Government Employee Relations Report.

The 1967-68 Panel

NORTHEASTERN STATES

CONNECTICUT – *T. W. Atkinson,* Handy & Harman, Fairfield; *Thomas A. Brady,* Sperry Rand Corp., Bridgeport; *B. C. Czech,* Colt's Inc., Hartford; *Thomas H. Decker,* Chesebrough-Pond's, Inc., Clinton; *George B. Gaedeke,* Allied Thermal Corp., New Britain; *Walter J. Hatcher,* Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford; *Frank H. Livingston,* The Hartford Gas Co., Hartford; *John R. Marchiando,* The Armstrong Rubber Co., West Haven; *Daniel Reinhardsen,* Flexible Tubing Corp., Guilford; *Laurence R. Swart,* Burndy Corp., Norwalk.

DELAWARE – *D. A. Bunce,* Hercules, Inc., Wilmington; *James Jordan,* Atlas Chemical Industries, Inc., Wilmington.

MASSACHUSETTS – *Charles D. Bond,* Dynamics Research Corp., Stoneham; *Robert G. Hennemuth,* Raytheon Co., Lexington; *Keith A. Krewson,* The Foxboro Co., Foxboro; *Frank H. Miklavic,* Polaroid Corp., Cambridge; *T. J. Treacy,* Filene's, Boston; *J. F. Tuscher,* The Carter's Ink Co., Cambridge; *James White,* Jordan Marsh Co., Boston; *Jack Ziegelmayer,* H. H. Scott, Inc., Maynard.

NEW JERSEY – *Nicholas Balbo,* The Pantasote Co., Passaic; *Joseph Siegel,* Radio Corporation of America, Camden; *Vincent J. Veninata,* The Grand Union Co., East Paterson; *Albert E. Weller,* Autographic Business Forms, Inc., South Hackensack.

NEW YORK – *Stanley R. Case,* Hartman Systems Co., Huntington Station; *Richard Galberaith,* The Carborundum Co., Niagara Falls; *John W. Hanselman,* St. Joseph Lead Co., New York; *Robert M. Hirsch,* McKaig-Hatch, Inc., Buffalo; *Harry J. Morrison,* Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., New York; *Carl W. Reed,* Neisner Brothers, Inc., Rochester; *R. J. Ripple,* IBM, Armonk; *A. Paul St. George,* Arwood Corp., Brooklyn; *Sol Salzman,* Times Square Stores Corp., Brooklyn; *Paul F. Shaw,* The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York; *Kenneth B. Wolfe,* Martin Marietta Corp., New York.

PENNSYLVANIA – *William C. Bergmann,* George K. Garrett Co., Inc., Philadelphia; *K. B. Chase,* Quaker State Oil Rfg. Corp., Bradford; *Ross C. Cibella,* Calgon Corp., Pittsburgh; *James R. Clark,* McCreary Tire & Rubber Co., Indiana; *C. E. Dean,* E. Keeler Co., Williamsport; *W. Thomas Finley,* Rohm & Haas Co., Philadelphia; *W. H. Gilman, Jr.,* Crown Products Corp., Philadelphia; *J. H. Goodworth,* Babcock & Wilcox Co., Beaver Falls; *K. P. Howard,* Grinnell Corp., Columbia; *James A. Kaebler,* Honeywell, Inc., Fort Washington; *W. David McIntire,* Catalytic Construction Co., Philadelphia; *David McMullin,* John Wanamaker Philadelphia, Inc., Philadelphia; *H. T. Milner,* Copper Range Co., Leetsdale; *R. J. Shingleton,* Heckett Engineering Co., Butler; *W. C. Stonehouse, Jr.,* Latrobe Steel Co., Latrobe; *Robert J. Wagner,* Harbison-Walker Refractories, Pittsburgh; *James J. Walsh,* AMETEK, Inc., Sellersville; *William R. Wortham,* The Trane Co., Dunmore.

RHODE ISLAND – *J. Robert Fryer,* Leesona Corp., Warwick.

SOUTHERN STATES

ALABAMA – *J. B. Brand, Jr.,* James B. Clow & Sons, Inc.; Birmingham; *A. A. Childs,* Page Aircraft Maintenance, Inc., Fort Rucker, *James L. Coley,* Russell Mills, Inc., Alexander City.

ARKANSAS – *Richard K. Benn,* Gerber Products Co., Ft. Smith; *Bill Cluck,* Dierks Forests, Inc., De Queen.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA – *Miss Alice Dulany Ball,* The United States Book Exchange, Inc.; *Greg Bowen,* Perpetual Building Association; *William L. Devries,* Manpower, Inc.; *Charles W. Ebert,* The Macke Co.; *R. G. Pierce,* Dynalectron Corp., *W. F. Rogers,* Giant Food, Inc.; *Mrs. Jean H. Sisco,* Woodward & Lothrop, Inc.

GEORGIA – *E. B. Baker,* The Arrow Co., Atlanta; *W. C. Byars,* American Cryogenics, Inc., Atlanta; *John F. Moran,* Maxson Electronics Corp., Macon.

KENTUCKY – *John T. Acree, III,* Lincoln Income Life Insurance Co., Louisville; *Donald A. Andrews,* National Mine Service Co., Ashland; *Lowell Z. Ashe,* Brown-Forman Distillers Corp., Louisville; *Dale R. Detlefs,* American Air Filter Co., Inc., Louisville; *J. R. George,* Standard Oil Co. (Ky.), Louisville; *Raymond R. Hawkins,* Kentucky & Indiana Terminal R.R. Co., Louisville.

LOUISIANA – *W. G. Allee, Jr.,* American Sugar Co., Arabi; *R. E. Bellows,* Wyandotte Chemicals Corp., Geismar; *Robert J. Stone,* Delta Steamship Lines, Inc., New Orleans.

(Continued on inside back cover)

EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Manpower Analysis	2
Achieving Effective Utilization of Manpower	4
Manpower Shortages	12
Problems in Accomplishing Proper Utilization of Manpower	16

INTRODUCTION

Many representatives of business are concerned about the tight labor market and the spiraling of salaries for new hires. At the same time, behavioral scientists who study the effectiveness of the work force are saying that management is not using present employees at their fullest capacity. To find out what companies are doing in the field of manpower utilization, BNA polled the member companies of its Personnel Policies Forum, listed on the inside cover.

Among the aspects of the subject that we covered in this survey are manpower audit, motivation, temporary help, handling of job changes, and the union's effect on manpower utilization. Sixty-five percent of the participating Forum companies have 1,000 or more employees, and are referred to as "larger" companies. Those with less than 1,000 employees make up 35 percent of the participating survey group. They are referred to as "smaller" companies.

Here are some of the findings:

- Over half of the companies conduct a formal periodic review or audit of manpower.

- Eighty-six percent of the companies communicate company goals to employees, and 77 percent report that they take steps to identify individual employees' goals.

- More companies - 38 percent - use recognition as a means to spur productivity than use any other means.

- Instruction in manpower analysis or planning is given to first-line supervisors in 44 percent of the firms.

- Almost all the companies say they try to motivate their employees to increase their skills.

- More than one fourth report some experience in tailoring a job to fit an employee's talents.

- Thirty-six percent of the companies have had problems among older employees because newly hired college graduates, owing to competition, are paid more than the older employees. Of those companies that report this problem, 36 percent say it is handled by reviewing and adjusting salaries. More than one fourth have not been able to cope with this problem successfully.

- More than half of the companies have some plan for coordinating staffing requirements, so that surplus manpower in one area can be loaned to other areas with shortages.

- Of those companies that have compared the efficiency of regular employees on overtime with the efficiency of temporary employees, 45 percent say that the regular employees are the more efficient, while 30 percent say they found the reverse to be true.

- Fifty-one percent of the companies report problems with pirating of employees they have trained. The most frequently mentioned means of coping with this problem is a reexamination of salaries.

- About three fifths of the companies that are unionized state that they have a contract with provisions in it that significantly hinder effective utilization of manpower.

• About two fifths of the unionized companies say that there are ways in which the union helps in working for effective utilization of manpower.

MANPOWER ANALYSIS

Formal Reviews

Forum members were asked if their firms conduct a formal periodic review or audit of manpower to determine whether: (1) overstaffing exists; (2) job descriptions are accurate; (3) individual employees could be more effective in other jobs; and (4) future manpower needs will be met. More companies - 69 percent - say they review manpower to determine if job descriptions are accurate, than review for the three other reasons listed. The least frequent reason given for manpower review is to determine if individuals could be more effective in other jobs. The biggest gap between the replies of the larger and smaller companies appears in the percentages of larger and smaller companies that cite determination of future manpower needs as a reason for the formal review. Seventy-four percent of the larger companies consider this a reason for a formal review, while only 49 percent of the smaller ones do.

Following is a percentage breakdown of the reasons for a formal manpower review or audit:

Reasons for Manpower Review

	Larger Companies	Smaller Companies	All Companies
To determine if overstaffing exists	55%	66%	59%
To determine if job descriptions are accurate	69	69	69
To determine if individuals could be more effective in other jobs	57	54	56
To determine if future manpower needs will be met	74	49	65

A few companies say they review manpower informally. One of the larger companies reports that a manpower analysis is made "only if it is felt necessary at any given time." Other comments on manpower reviews include:

> Several functional supervisors have authorized audits of their line departments effecting reductions in manpower.--C. R. Palmer, General Wage and Salary Supervisor, Consumers Power Co., Jackson, Mich.

> Over the past four years we have integrated our individual merit review system with a management audit which is completed during the first quarter of our fiscal year. This audit reveals many situations which help us to plan specific manpower actions for the other three quarters.

> A vital part of the management audit on a company-wide basis is a comparison of personnel by classification groupings. This makes it possible to correct inequities that can arise during the year from the individual merit reviews.--Personnel Director, Larger Company

> We are currently developing a Human Resources Planning and Development function to coordinate placement, development and effective utilization of manpower. Prospects for the future include the following activities: Manpower Information Programs, Forecasts and Audits, Participative Goal Setting, Career Planning and Development.--Keith A. Krewson, Corporate Director of Personnel, The Foxboro Co., Foxboro, Mass.

Of the groups covered in the review, more companies make a manpower audit of clerical and managerial personnel than blue-collar or professional. Here is a breakdown:

Groups Covered in the Manpower Review

	Blue-Collar	Clerical	Professional	Managerial
Larger Companies	57%	71%	82%	77%
Smaller Companies	54	69	54	74
All Companies	56	70	65	76

One company executive who says that all hourly employees are covered in his firm's review, explains:

> Under the Uniform Labor Agreement of Pacific Coast Pulp and Paper Mills, a job analysis program is carried out whereby either the management or the local union can request analysis of changed jobs for hourly employees.
>
> Annual reviews between department heads and blue-collar, clerical, professional and managerial employees are held. At this time changes are made in responsibilities and remuneration.--G. A. Okerlund, Personnel Manager and Safety Director, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Bellingham, Wash.

Measuring Utilization

What bases are used to measure manpower utilization in each of these groups?

For blue-collar employees -- 48 percent of the companies measure utilization by productivity. Some specify productivity reports, production schedule demands, and sales to productivity ratios. One of the larger companies measures blue-collar utilization on productivity per unit. Profits are used as a basis of measuring blue-collar utilization in 16 percent of the Forum companies. Other bases of measurement for the blue-collar group are "incentive return" and "predicted growth of business."

For clerical employees -- 61 percent of the companies measure utilization by work analysis. Companies that use this as a basis specify "ratio of personnel to volume of work," "work flow," "performance in relation to job and department objectives," "efficiency-time utilization," and "manning table." Thirteen percent of the companies use profits as a measure of utilization of the clerical group. Potential, knowledge, and improvement are mentioned in addition.

For professional employees -- utilization is measured by work analysis in 61 percent of the Forum companies. "Improvement", "objectives satisfied," "long range contributions," technical proficiency," "work load," and "knowledge," are some of the items considered in work analysis for the professional group. Profits are used as a means of measuring utilization of professional employees in 13 percent of the companies.

For managerial employees -- work analysis is used to rate manpower utilization in 47 percent of the Forum companies. Included in the work analysis are: "performance appraisal," "operation improvement," "organization effectiveness," "resourcefulness," "replaceability," "potential," "knowledge," and "subordinate group's performance." An executive from one of the larger companies that measures managerial manpower utilization by the subordinate group's performance, describes the analysis:

> Another important aspect of the audit is a review of each organization group which is authorized a supervisor or manager. By checking contract budgets, performance, manloading, and ratings, we get an index of group efficiency which aids in appraisal of supervisory personnel.--Personnel Director, Larger Company.

Profits are used as a means of measuring managerial utilization in 38 percent of the companies. The smaller companies tend to do this more than the larger -- 49 percent of the smaller ones compared with 32 percent of the larger.

Meeting Future Manpower Needs

Procedures to meet future manpower needs are used by 83 percent of all the Forum companies. Of firms following such a procedure, 46 percent used projections. Projections for periods ranging from six months to five years in the future are specified, and several companies note that they include periodic reviews of their projections. Here are some of the Forum executives' comments on how they use projections to meet future manpower needs:

Each operation is required, based on our sales forecast, to project additional manpower requirements each year. We have found a very close relationship between our manpower requirement and sales volume that makes this indicator an excellent barometer. Also, our long range planning requires a breakdown on a divisional basis of manpower needs over the next five years.--A. Paul St. George, Manager of Industrial Relations, Arwood Corp., Rockleigh, N.J.

Market forecasts converted to specific type manhours.--Director, Industrial Relations, Smaller Company.

Review anticipated production requirements on all product lines for year ahead with sales and gradually hire and train accordingly.--George B. Gaedeke, Personnel Director, Tuttle & Bailey Div. of Allied Thermal Corp., New Britain, Conn.

Manpower development is mentioned as part of their planning by 45 percent of all the companies that follow some procedure to meet future manpower needs.

Continually training and developing: internally and externally--seminars, universities, etc.--James A. Disney, Director of Industrial Relations, Dempster Brothers, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.

Pre-plan for replacement of present staff internally - several floating trainees for unknown needs.--V. J. Veninata, Director of Personnel, The Grand Union Co., East Paterson, N. J.

Profile current manpower against future organization requirements and determine resultant employee development programs and implement.--Vice President, Industrial Relations, Larger Company.

Twenty-nine percent of the companies that prepare for future manpower needs list recruiting and hiring in advance of need as part of the procedure. Executives from two of the larger companies comment on this:

Overhire qualified applicants and put in reserve unit (clerical). Recruit from colleges for managerial positions. Manpower replacement charts established for official family.--Paul F. Shaw, Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N. Y.

We . . . try to hire a number of college graduates every spring (whether we need them or not) so that they will be trained and available for needs in an expanding company.--W. C. Stonehouse, Jr., Vice President, Industrial Relations, Latrobe Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa.

Other steps which are taken in meeting future manpower needs consist of performance review, review of turnover, drawing up manning table, division analysis, providing good backup, and upgrading selection.

ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

Communicating Company Goals to Employees

Communicating company goals to employees and their role in achieving them is a policy followed by 86 percent of the Panel members. Ninety-two percent of the larger companies and 74 percent of the smaller do this. Of the companies that communicate company goals, 49 percent use house organs and 48 percent use meetings. A number of the executives say the meetings are for management only. Additional communication media in use include: interviews (29 percent); other company publications, such as management newsletters and special employee bulletins (11 percent); merit reviews (10 percent); and letters home to employees (10 percent). Also, some convey the management-employee goal information during training sessions, including orientation. And a handful take care of the issue through management-by-objectives programs or bulletin boards. One company communicates company goals and the employee's role in them by means of follow-up interviews with new hires after 90 days on the job; another does this during counseling.

Following is a percentage breakdown of the methods used by Forum companies to point up organization goals and how the work of each employee contributes to them:

Methods of Communicating Company Goals and Employees' Roles in Achieving Them*

	All Companies	Larger Companies	Smaller Companies
House organ	49%	50%	46%
Meetings	48	45	54
Interviews	29	27	35
Company publications other than house organs	9	12	4
Merit reviews	10	15	0
Letters home	10	8	15
Training sessions	8	7	12
Management-by-objectives programs	6	7	4
Bulletin boards	6	5	8
Other	6	11	0

* Figures total more than 100 percent because some companies use more than one of the above methods.

Included in the "other" category is information conveyed through company functions, policy statements, the union, department review, and sales report.

Two executives describe their special publications:

AMFACTS is a special publication for all employees, designed to highlight special projects on which particular emphasis is desired. Sometimes only an informative version is published, but more frequently, special projects are pointed out with need for additional employee cooperation to achieve most return from the company investment.--E. P. Dupras, Manager, Industrial Relations Administration, AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

We recently added to our monthly Personnel Bulletin an article headed "Notes from the President." This is an informal presentation of company goals. This publication is sent to all supervisors, and in many cases, circulated among their personnel.--G. L. Bowen, Vice President, Perpetual Building Association, Washington, D. C.

Forum members expressing themselves on meetings state:

Periodically our chief administrative officer (Corporate VP) will meet with employees and present our corporate aims and objectives. We have found that a personal, spoken message carries more weight and is accepted better than messages through written communication.--Daniel Reinhardsen, Assistant Vice President, Administration and Personnel, Flexible Tubing Co., Gilford, Conn.

We have at Pitney-Bowes a Council of Personnel Relations which requires that every supervisor in the company meet with his employees at a formal meeting, either monthly or bi-monthly (monthly in the factory, and bi-monthly in the offices) to discuss with them the company's progress, problems, goals, policy changes, and to hear from them any problems they may have.--W. J. Hatcher, Assistant to the Vice President for Employee Relations, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

In a multi-angled tie-up, an executive discloses:

We have a general statement of corporate objectives which is utilized in management communications and a "performance summary and individual development program" which is a goal-setting and goal-measuring vehicle as part of our Corporate Compensation Programs.--Administrator, Compensation, Benefits & Training, Larger Company.

Identifying Individual Employee Goals

A concept derived from behavioral science, that employee goals are an important factor in motivation, is becoming the belief of a growing number of employers, according to the National Association of Manufacturers' publication, "What's Wrong with Work." What percentage of Forum members take steps to identify an employee's goals and discuss how they may be attained in conjunction with company goals? Seventy-seven percent of the survey participants report that they take such action -- 80 percent of the larger companies and 71 percent of the smaller.

To accomplish this type of communication, about half of all the companies identifying individual goals employ merit reviews. A few executives say they limit this practice to professional and managerial employees. Twenty-one percent attempt to correlate management-employee goal achievement with specific interviews on the subject. One company conducts a follow-up interview with new hires after 90 days on the job in this connection, and 12 percent make a try with management-by-objectives programs. Others enter into diverse discussion arrangements to correlate goals, one type being discussions during training. These take the form of "Career Development Review Committees," personal interviews as part of a personnel development program, and orientation. Some discussion meetings involve management only; others include the union and management; still others are individual discussions with first-line supervisors and above. A small number of companies go in for psychological testing to help correlate individual employee goals with those of the company.

Following is a percentage breakdown of methods used to identify employee goals and correlate their achievement with those of the company:

Methods of Identifying Individual Employee Goals and Correlating Their Achievement With That of Company Goals*

	All Companies	Larger	Smaller
Merit reviews	51%	56%	40%
Interviews	21	23	16
Management-by-objectives	12	12	12
Development & orientation programs	8	6	12
Discussion with first-line supervisor & above	5	6	4
Psychological testing	4	2	8
Other	9	6	16

* Figures total more than 100 percent because some companies use more than one of the above methods.

The "Other" category includes such bridges of communication as tuition-refund programs, counseling, letters home, and profit sharing programs.

Some executive comments relating to this behavioral area are:

We hit hard this theme in presupervisory training groups.--James A. Disney, Director of Industrial Relations, Dempster Brothers, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.

Annually each employee is given the opportunity to formally advise the company of his goals. The interview with his immediate supervisor that follows allows for an understanding on the part of the employee as to how individual and company goals are entwined.--W. L. Entz, Director of Personnel, General Telephone Co. of the Southeast, Durham, S. C.

We're embarrassed because he can identify his and we're not sure of the company's.--Manager, Industrial Relations, Larger Company.

. . . this approach is, however, limited in use.--Charles W. Ebert, Regional Operations Manager, The Macke Co., Cheverly, Md.

Discuss with employee who demonstrates interest [the identification of his individual goals and achievement of them in correlation with company goals.]--R. V. Gillispie, Manager of Industrial Relations, Gulf States Tube Corp., Rosenberg, Tex.

Each person's development to maximum potential is to be planned and discussed with person.--Paul F. Shaw, Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

Productivity Motivation

With basic needs fairly well satisfied by traditional productivity motivators such as more money and fringes, new incentives are being sought. Attuned to psychological needs, behavioral concepts of

motivation are meeting with renewed interest. Of the three productivity motivators cited most often by Forum companies, two are based on behavioral principles: recognition and challenging work.

Recognition is the motivator named most often--it is cited by 38 percent of the Forum members. Specific means of recognition include: plant publications, group meetings, personal compliments, and special assignments. The second behavioral motivator, allotment of challenging work, is mentioned by 28 percent of the companies that try to spur productivity. Profit sharing, a more traditional employee motivator, is utilized by 33 percent of the companies.

Other stimulants in use to a lesser degree by the Panel are contests (16 percent) and incentive programs (13 percent), including those for quantity and quality clerical work, and for groups as well as individuals. Also cited are performance awards (11 percent). In groups ranging between 5 and 10 percent, Forum members mention: monetary awards, promotions, suggestion systems, training, and management-by-objectives. Techniques listed by less than 5 percent of companies include: performance appraisal, knowledgeable supervision, more responsibility, and stock-purchase plans. Two percent of the companies say their approach to motivation is "human treatment." Wages as a productivity motivator hits the bottom of the list at 1 percent.

Success with motivational programs in increasing productivity is reported by 82 percent of the companies that use motivational techniques. Six percent record failure; and 12 percent either do not comment as to the success of their motivational procedure, or else say that they cannot determine the degree of success in this field.

Some Panel views regarding various productivity motivators are:

Being in the life insurance business we naturally are people oriented because our chief product, life insurance, is geared to the needs of people. Continuing this philosophy, we have tried to maintain a very simple program of letting our people know what is expected and showing them appreciation for the tremendous contributions they have made toward our success.--John T. Acree, III, Vice President, Lincoln Life Insurance Co., Louisville, Ky.

Presidential Award Plan, Stock Option Plan, and a Compensation Program whose policy and administrative guides cause significant differentials to exist between persons performing at satisfactory, commendable or outstanding levels [are used].--Compensation & Training Director, Larger Company.

In management jobs, salary increases are related to performance.--C. R. Palmer, General Wage & Salary Supervisor, Consumers Power Co., Jackson, Mich.

We have an office incentive system under which a large percentage of our clerical employees are employed. *This system gives bonuses for extra* quality and quantity of work above the standard for the job, which bonuses are over and above the good, going rate of pay for the particular work performed. We also have an incentive system in our factory which guarantees the factory worker the rate of pay that he has earned under the incentive system in our factory for a three month period, with a review at the end of three months to determine what his performance has been in the preceding three months so that his rate may be set for the subsequent three month period. This gives level earnings without the ups and downs you normally find under a piece work plan and allows for more stable financial planning by the employee and his family.--W. J. Hatcher, Assistant to the Vice President for Employee Relations, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

...difficulties lie with those employees at top rate of their jobs who are not interested in or do not have the abilities for advancement.--W. L. Entz, Director of Personnel, General Telephone Co. of the Southeast, Durham, N. C.

...success depends almost exclusively on good supervision.--Kenneth M. Hall, Personnel Director, G. H. Tennant Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

Always searching for better methods.--R. G. Sherman, Assistant Vice President, Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

Annually, the President addresses a letter to all employees, delivered by mail to employee's home address, announcing Profit Sharing Plan results for the year and encouraging further efforts

to increase profitability in segments which did not meet announced goals.--E. P. Dupras, Manager, Industrial Relations Administration, AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

Instruction in Manpower Planning

With competent personnel increasingly hard to come by, company growth may be hindered more by a shortage of capable people than money. To find out what is being done by the Panel to meet this basic problem, we asked them, "Do you instruct first-line supervisors in manpower analysis or planning? And if so, how?"

Almost 45 percent of all the companies report they do give instruction. Training in manpower planning is given through:

Management Development -- by 55 percent of companies with manpower analysis instructions. Instruction may be formal or informal, on or off the job. Aspects covered include: personnel expense, budgeting, and productivity reports; behavioral science; and supervisory responsibilities generally. One company instructs in manpower analysis and planning concurrently with production planning. Another uses the American Management Association's Supervisory Training Series.

Meetings -- by 14 percent. In one case a manual of methods and scheduling standards is established; in others, department and company goals are reviewed and modern management techniques are taught. Too, one company uses regular meetings of a Manpower Action Committee for Training to determine manpower personnel needs after review of market and sales forecasts.

Combined Efforts -- by 18 percent. This approach encompasses such procedures as: individual counseling with members of industrial engineering and accounting departments plus the plant superintendent; working with the industrial engineering and product control departments; and assigning first-line supervisors a high degree of authority and responsibility while providing staff help.

Informal Procedure -- by 9 percent. One firm initiates individual training, a second gives training upon individual request, and a third trains through personal discussions with higher management.

Projects -- by 7 percent. These involve such undertakings as manpower audits, manning tables, and seasonal basic force changes.

One executive remarks that his company never instructs first-line supervisors in manpower analysis or planning and goes on to say:

> We expect him to possess this valuable tool from some mysterious source which we never identify...I was struck with the dreary realization that (in my opinion) we didn't seem to be doing much of this (effective utilization of manpower) very well at all.--Industrial Relations Manager, Larger Company.

Salaries for New College Graduates

The Panel was asked, "Have you had any problems among older employees because newly-hired college graduates, owing to competition, are paid more than the older employees?"

Thirty-six percent of the Forum executives answer "Yes." Predominantly, they tackle this problem by discussion (almost 40 percent) and trying to keep salaries in line (36 percent). Discussion is used to point out certain circumstances, e.g., the younger person's formal educational background, his potential contribution to company growth, and the fact that competition leaves no choice. Companies that try to keep salaries in line as a solution, cite the following: special increases to older employees; continual review of salary schedules and complaints; and merit increases. A few attempt to cope with this particular age vs. youth hiring dilemma by moving older employees to more challenging jobs.

A substantial number (28 percent) of survey participants with this particular hiring problem find it too hard a nut to crack and are left with no solution but some concern. Anxiety may be noted in such expressions as "We are struggling with the problem;" or [Problem is] "poorly handled;" or "No solutions as yet." Others find the situation minimal enough to ignore. On the other hand, some have no problem, but take preventive action. One company does not employ college graduates, while another does not pay them more than older employees. A strict policy of promotion-from-within is a palliative in use by a third company. Additional methods to meet this problem, Panel members report, are: a salary structure to meet the situation, and working with the maturity curve.

Panel members with salary problems in the hiring of current college graduates vs. older employees, have this to say:

> We try to keep salaries confidential but we have recently noticed some complaints in some areas. These areas seem to coincide with those where recent new hires took place.--Industrial Relations Manager, Larger Company.

> We are careful to keep our salaries in line with economic development and maintain differentials as necessary.--W. C. Byars, Director, Employee Relations, American Cryogenics, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

> We have never paid a newly-hired college graduate more than older employees in their same job category. However, the gap is less than it was several years ago and this has caused us some problems. We try to handle this problem through efficient wage and salary administration after the newly-hired college graduate has completed his informal training program.--J. Carroll Thomas, Director of Personnel, Concrete Materials, Inc., Charlotte, N. C.

> Depends on type of person who is upset. Generally explain facts as they are.--Dan E. Butt, Executive Assistant, H. E. Butt Grocery Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.

> Such problems are never really solved. When a disparity exists, it's usually between a young man with potential and a veteran with no more potential.--Donald P. Lacker, Vice President, The First National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio.

> Through personal concern of the individuals involved the company's position on the hiring of college graduates is relayed to our older employees...My feeling is that the older employees accept it, but do not agree with it.--Richard L. Roche, Personnel Director, Cambridge Wire Cloth Co., Cambridge, Md.

> Merit review plan tied to results-oriented performance appraisal.--J. Robert Fryer, Director, Industrial Relations, Leesona Corp., Warwick, R. I.

> Offer opportunities for advancement to qualified persons.--Paul F. Shaw, Vice President The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N. Y.

> It is usual to hear the remark, "I have worked on this job for 10 years and a new man makes almost the same as me after he has been on the job only six months."--Manager, Personnel, Larger Company.

> We have not hidden the fact and we have adjusted our salary administration program to minimize the impact.--Thomas H. Decker, Industrial Relations Manager, Chesebrough-Pond's, Inc., Clinton, Conn.

Those executives with no salary obstacles to overcome in the area of new college hires vs. older employees volunteer these explanations:

> Everyday contact is generally with managers who are equally or better paid.--J. W. Streidl, Director, Manpower Planning & Development, Packaging Corp. of America, Evanston, Ill.

> We work hard to avoid the problem as stated and thereby have less acute problems.--Director, Industrial Relations, Larger Company.

> Do not employ new graduates. Salaries vs. performance [is] ridiculous.--R. V. Gillispie, Manager, of Industrial Relations, Gulf States Tube Corp., Rosenberg, Tex.

> This seems to be accepted as a fact of life in the aerospace industry.--W. L. Babecky, Director, Industrial Relations, Babcock Electronics Corp., Costa Mesa, Calif.

Survey participants respond with an overwhelming affirmative when the question is put, "Do you try to motivate employees to improve their skills?" Ninety-nine percent of all the companies answer "Yes." Top skill motivators reported are: tuition assistance, by 68 percent; and training programs, by 35 percent.

Tuition assistance may be in the form of payment of 100 percent, including book costs; or 75 percent if successful; or 50 percent for college level courses. Costs for salaried employees only are shared by one firm. One company pays 50 percent for any self improvement course, even though it may not be work associated. Still another correlates work schedules with school hours for company-subsidized technical courses. And lastly, one company concentrates on management development, including the use of tuition assistance.

The list of training programs that are used to motivate skill improvement includes all levels in a variety of skills. The training may be conducted or sponsored by the company, on or off the job.

In addition, 13 percent of the executives say they encourage education by advocating such sources as: correspondence schools, evening college classes, and professional society membership. Some companies also provide information on outside classes and grant educational leave of absence.

Opportunity for promotion is listed as another skill galvanizer in 20 percent of the companies. Qualification as a basis for promotion is publicized and job vacancies are posted for bidding.

Two Forum members with one basic thought on motivating skill upgrading state their case this way:

> We expand at all times and with every opportunity with our employees, [so] that a person must first prepare for opportunity and be ready when it comes. We stand behind this philosophy by conducting courses. (We even pay the employee to attend.) [We then draw] on this pool of pretrained employees when we upgrade into supervision or into other key clerical jobs, even sales.--James A. Disney, Director of Industrial Relations, Dempster Brothers, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.

> Every effort is made to encourage employees to prepare themselves for more responsible positions and to promote such employees rather than hire new employees to fill the higher level functions.--Peter Uglesich, Personnel Manager, Hewitt-Robins, Cincinnati, Ohio.

More skill motivators mentioned are: counseling, performance reviews, goal setting, and sales contests.

To determine Panel use of still another strategy for achieving effective utilization of manpower, we requested, "Please describe any experience you have had in tailoring a job to fit an employee's talents, rather than training him to fit a particular job."

Nearly 30 percent of the Forum members do this -- 28 percent of the smaller companies and 27 percent of the larger ones.

Executives comment on their experiences with adjusting jobs to individual capacities:

Research & Development

> We have a large research and development staff. This gives many opportunities to tailor the jobs to the professional's talents.--Personnel Director, Larger Company.

> This [job tailoring] is true of most jobs in our R&D efforts.--Charles D. Bond, Director of Personnel, Dynamics Research Corp., Stoneham, Mass.

Mechanical, Technical, Administrative & Professional

> This cannot occur in the flow of the production line or highly routinized clerical functions, but probably occurs far more frequently than most companies recognize in the technical, administrative, and managerial areas. We are continuously recognizing individual strengths and shortcomings. When we have a good man, we frequently adjust the job and even the organization to take advantage of strengths and crutch his weaknesses.--W. L. Babecky, Director-Industrial Relations, Babcock Electronics Corp., Costa Mesa, Calif.

> A substantial part of our management and professional positions are created around or altered by incumbents.--Bruno C. Czech, Vice President, Personnel & Community Relations, Colt Industries, Inc., Hartford, Conn.

We sometimes do this in engineering and administration when we have sufficient manpower for such flexibility.--W. C. Byars, Director, Employee Relations, American Cryogenics, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

Small mill machines and assembly fixtures and related automated equipment usually purchased outside the company are now made in house to fit the talents of a master mechanic and tool engineer currently employed.--Manager, Personnel, Larger Company.

Recently we have had a most rewarding experience in promoting a lower level supervisor into a reconstructed and defined job as company director. By utilizing the man's talents in handling people and transferring the engineering aspects of the safety work to our claims staff a more than creditable job is being performed. -- General Manager, Smaller Company.

We do this quite often. Example: a certain type shop background brought into a quality control department.--James A. Disney, Director of Industrial Relations, Dempster Brothers, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn.

Clerical

...We have...eliminated typing from some jobs so that we could hire clerical people without typist skills.--W. J. Hatcher, Assistant to the Vice President for Employee Relations, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

We have done this in lower level clerical and operative jobs.--Jean Head Sisco, Vice President-Personnel, Woodward & Lothrop, Wash., D. C.

Older Employees

This has been done for several oldtimers because of rare background in certain areas. Sometimes they are made advisors to the more qualified supervisor.--J. A. Kilo, Corporate Director of Industrial Relations, Ferry Cap & Set Screw Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Because of lack of retirement program we often tailor a job to fit needs of worker so as to continue him on social security.--G. S. Anderson, Vice President, Personnel, Burris Manufacturing Co., Lincolnton, N. C.

A job which needs personal interest and accuracy was being performed by a loyal employee with long service. Employee reached maximum on particular job grade. Increased responsibility to fit employee's talents which increased job's value to company and raised the job grade. Happy employee and excellent productivity.--John T. Acree, III, Vice President, Lincoln Income Life Insurance Co., Louisville, Ky.

Handicapped

Have utilized a deaf mute in high noise area.--Clinton J. Frank, Jr., Vice President-Director of Industrial Relations, Hamilton Cosco, Inc., Columbus, Ind.

Only isolated case of communications serviceman with a physical handicap limited to bench work.--E. P. Dupras, Manager, Industrial Relations Administration, AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

Special Personalized Consideration

Bad [experience]. Employee does only things he likes.--R. V. Gillispie, Manager of Industrial Relations, Gulf States Tube Corp., Rosenberg, Tex.

Had a 15-year employee. Management said to retain him. Also said he can't do this and he can't do that. We simply designed a job that had no elements of this and that and turned him loose. He's doing well at an inflated salary.--Manager, Industrial Relations, Larger Company.

Miscellaneous

This is done to some extent through informal evaluations.--Kent J. Jorgensen, Personnel & Industrial Relations Supervisor, American Gilsonite Co., Gilsonite, Colo.

By complementing employee with proper assistance [job tailoring is done].--Blake T. Mohney, Corporate Director of Industrial Relations, Hoover Ball & Bearing Co., Ann Arbor, Mich.

These have normally been done in a temporary situation only.--W. L. Entz, Director of Personnel General Telephone Company of the Southeast, Durham, N. C.

Widely done here in organization change and development.--Director Compensation & Training, Larger Company.

MANPOWER SHORTAGES

Coordinating Staffing Requirements

Forum executives were asked if their companies follow a plan for coordinating staffing requirements, in order to loan surplus manpower in one area to areas with manpower shortages. Fifty-three percent of the companies report that they do have such a plan -- 57 percent of the smaller companies and 51 percent of the larger ones. In describing their plans for coordinating staffing requirements, 19 percent of the companies that have a plan say that the personnel department operates, 15 percent say their plan is informal, 6 percent say that department heads are responsible, and another 6 percent report that their plan operates by way of a central inventory-of-skills bank. Thirty-two percent of the companies that report having plans do not tell how they are coordinated. A number of the plans are so varied they cannot be categorized.

Here are some descriptive comments that offer a cross section of all the plans for coordination:

A daily morning tour encompassing 22 different problems is investigated by executive level staff members.--George B. Gaedeke, Personnel Director, Tuttle & Bailey Div. of Allied Thermal Corp., New Britain, Conn.

[Selection of] versatile employees and [establishment of] good internal communications.--G. L. Bowen, Vice President, Perpetual Building Association, Washington, D. C.

Labor contract arrangement whereby employees can exercise option to work out of their seniority sequence.--Lowell Z. Ashe, Manager of Industrial Relations, Brown-Forman Distillers Corp., Louisville, Ky.

Primarily in hourly factory and salaried clerical areas, through coordinated daily reports.--Joseph F. Tuscher, Vice President, Personnel, The Carter's Ink Co., Cambridge, Mass.

Needs are coordinated through area personnel who find available help by contacting various departments.--Paul F. Shaw, Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N. Y.

Temporary layoffs in single department used.--G. J. Grimmer, Personnel Manager, Keyes Fibre Co., Hammond, Ind.

Informal swapping of clerical and supervisory personnel - scheduling of management trainees to departments during peak periods.--R. D. Patton, Industrial Relations Manager, O'Keefe & Merritt Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Between two plants 20 miles apart - same union, different locals.--Personnel Manager, Larger Company.

This is widely done on an interdivisional basis, at the professional level.--Personnel Director, Larger Company.

Operating managers and industrial relations managers communicate regularly to plan transfers or loans. Job order inventories distributed to other facilities by industrial relations departments.--Director of Industrial Relations, Larger Company.

Our company has three divisions. We have been successful in transferring our employees, departmental, without too much difficulty. This is possible since our divisions deal basically with the same type of material, etc.--Richard L. Roche, Personnel Director, Cambridge Wire Cloth Co., Cambridge, Md.

...Handled on a request basis. Our first-line supervisors have been schooled over the years together, to get the job done through cooperation with each other.--John T. Acree, III, Vice President, Lincoln Income Life Insurance Co., Louisville, Ky.

Pooling Arrangements

More companies report pooling arrangements for clerical and unskilled employees, than report pooling for maintenance, skilled labor, professional, or managerial employees. The following table shows a breakdown of the companies that have labor pools:

Groups That Have a Pooling Arrangement

	Clerical	Unskilled	Skilled	Maintenance	Professional	Managerial
Larger Companies	34%	28%	20%	22%	23%	22%
Smaller Companies	49	31	11	17	14	17
All Companies	39	29	17	20	20	20

Some of the executives describe particular pooling arrangements:

Yard pool employees are trained as "spares" in a number of departments.--G. A. Okerlund, Personnel Manager and Safety Director, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Bellingham, Wash.

Maintain a small administrative staff group in corporate section who can be loaned out in needed areas.--Clinton J. Frank, Jr., Vice President, Director of Industrial Relations, Hamilton-Cosco, Inc., Columbus, Ind.

Will hire four-six men on corporate staff to be available at other locations.--J. B. Brand, Director of Industrial Relations, Clow Corp., Birmingham, Ala.

Temporary Employees

Clerical -- 80 percent of the companies name at least one source that they use to obtain temporary clerical help during peak periods. Of this group, employment agencies are mentioned most often - 83 percent of the larger companies and 69 percent of the smaller ones list this source. Among the agencies mentioned are: Manpower, Inc.; Kelly Girls; and the United States Employment Service. Ten percent of the larger companies and 16 percent of the smaller companies say they use their own employees during peak periods, and 9 percent of the companies hire high school and college students during peak periods. Other sources of temporary clerical help are: retired employees (4 percent of all companies that use temporary help), on-call list of persons who want to work (4 percent), advertisements (3 percent), and local residents (3 percent). One company each reports using new hires and moonlighters for temporary clerical help during peak periods. Two companies say they use walk-in applicants as a source.

Explaining how they get temporary clerical help, two executives from larger companies comment:

Being located away from a large metropolitan area, we have developed our own temporary work pool for all types of skills. For example, we have found a number of housewives [with] excellent secretarial skills who are looking for two or three days of work a week. By having four or five such persons on call, we have been able to meet our peak needs.--Thomas H. Decker, Industrial Relations Manager, Chesebrough-Pond's Inc., Clinton, Conn.

> Have record of people who will work on part-time basis or on per diem basis. We contact these persons. During summer months, staff members are asked to refer sons and daughters for summer work.--Paul F. Shaw, Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N. Y.

Unskilled--only 43 percent of all the companies name sources that are used to obtain temporary unskilled labor for peak periods. Of these companies that do list a source for temporary unskilled labor, 42 percent name employment agencies. Sixteen percent of the companies use high school and college students as temporary unskilled workers, 14 percent use their own employees, and 12 percent get temporary unskilled labor from contractors. A few companies mention union hiring halls, on-call lists, advertisements, retirees, and walk-in applicants as sources of temporary unskilled help.

Two executives from larger Forum companies comment on college students as a source of temporary unskilled employees:

> [With regard to] temporary unskilled help, the nature of our business permits us to adjust our production load to the summer when we will employ as many as 150 college students. We find that they make superior employees who go out of their way to do a good job. Some of these students have been with us for three or four summers.--Thomas H. Decker, Industrial Relations Manager, Chesebrough-Pond's Inc., Clinton, Conn.

> We plan vacations for hourly workers so that they peak in the summer months, during which time we replace vacationers with college students, up to as high as 15 percent of the work force.--W. C. Stonehouse, Jr., Vice President, Industrial Relations, Latrobe Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa.

Skilled--sources of temporary skilled labor are named by 34 percent of all the participating companies. Fifty-six percent of these companies obtain skilled temporary help through employment agencies, and slightly more than a third say they use their own employees by means of shifting, loans and transfers, overtime, and upgrading. Twelve percent specify advertisements, and 9 percent, high schools and colleges. One smaller company lists "union" as a source for temporary skilled labor and a larger company includes "service personnel" as a source.

Professional--out of 35 percent of the companies that list a source for obtaining temporary professional employees, 46 percent say they use employment agencies, 29 percent use their own employees, and 26 percent use consulting firms. Two of the smaller companies and one of the larger name advertisements as a source, and one larger company mentions "university" as a source.

Managerial--barely over 20 percent of all the Forum companies name a source for obtaining temporary managerial employees for peak periods, and 72 percent of those that do, say the source is their own employees. About two fifths of the companies that use their own employees specify that this is done on a "double duties" basis. Consulting firms are used by 29 percent of all the companies that name a source of temporary managerial employees. Other sources cited are: agencies, advertisements, and "university."

Asked to describe any problems they have in hiring temporary help, 41 percent of the Forum companies say they have no significant problems with temporary help. Some of them explain why: "hire contract help when necessary - expense is offset by the convenience;" "very adequate results once agency knows your standards;" "not on payroll - hired through temporary job agency."

Twenty-nine percent of the companies state a problem with temporary help, and these answers vary considerably. Some examples of problems described by Panel executives, and how they are handled, are: "finding skill level required for sufficient hours - [solved by hiring] moonlighters;" "applicants do not meet minimum employment standards - usually waive such standards;" "resentment by regular employees of temporary engineering and drafting [employees] -- keep them for a minimum period;" "difficult to find temporary help - have found source in employing military;" "union sends over the type of individual who is the 'cry baby' or 'radical' - [handled by] careful screening;" "persons do not know operations - train them using programmed instruction." A few companies say they have problems with temporary help because of their unions, but do not say how they cope with these problems: "problem with plant temporary help is union attitudes regarding pay and fringes - we're stymied by contract language;" and "holiday pay - vacation pay - infringement on rights of co-workers."

About three fourths of the Panel report that they keep a file on temporary help sucessfully employed in the past. One of these companies says its list is for clerical help, "especially keypunch operators."

Among the companies that do not keep a file on temporary help, one executive states that temporary help "varies with each situation." Another adds that although no file is kept, some foremen keep lists of past temporary help. A third executive comments: "take pot luck always."

Fifty-three percent of all the companies have compared the productivity of regular employees on overtime with that of temporary employees. In making the comparison, 45 percent found regular employees on overtime to be more efficient than the temporary employees. Thirty percent say they found the reverse to be true, and the remainder of the companies report that the efficiency of the groups vary with each situation or that they are about equal in efficiency. One company states that it has never used either temporary or regular employees on overtime. It schedules production to eliminate such a need.

Companies that found regular employees on overtime to be more efficient than temporary help offer these explanations: "because of the background lacking in many cases with temporary personnel;" "because of job motivation;" and [regular employees have] "greater experience on special work."

Companies that found temporary employees to be more efficient than regular employees on overtime describe the temporary employees in terms such as: "independent attitude;" "more efficient if properly oriented;" "eager to return next year;" "more incentive to retain job."

An executive from a smaller company comments:

> Among our factory employees, we find a regular overtime diet causes employees to slow down or "pace" themselves for the longer day; hence our company wasn't getting a reasonable productivity increase for the premium pay.--Jack F. Schuhman, Personnel Director, The T. L. Smith Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Of the companies that found efficiency varying with the situation, a few explain that "temporary help is better at low skill jobs, and regular employees are better at professional jobs"; "depends on individual"; "depends on duration of overtime requirements."

Utilizing Older Employees

Little more than one fourth of the companies - 29 percent of the larger ones and 23 percent of the smaller ones - report that they allow career extensions even through they have a mandatory retirement age. Sixty percent of the larger companies and 49 percent of the smaller ones do not allow exceptions to their mandatory retirement age. Two of these companies, however, qualify their answers: "except occasional call-in on emergencies;" and "individual may at company request extend his retirement."

Twenty-two percent of the companies that allow career extensions on a mandatory retirement age limit the extensions to managerial employees. Two of them do so on a consulting basis "depending on retired employees and company needs."

About half of the companies that allow exceptions handle each case individually. A number of them specify that extensions are granted by management approval, and for a limited time. In two companies, careers may be extended on a part-time or temporary basis. One executive says that if a retiring individual is "more capable than his replacement, [the company] might extend his work period if [this] does not deny promotion to another."

In 15 percent of the companies that grant extensions on the mandatory retirement age, the extensions are allowed where critical skills or talents are required. Other areas in which extensions are given in Forum companies are sales positions and clerical jobs.

Piracy of Trained Employees

More than half of the Forum companies - 51 percent of both the larger and smaller ones - report that they have had problems with pirating of employees they have trained. A few of these companies express resignation about the problem: "That's the name of the game;" "This is a way of life." However, other

companies indicate this problem is more serious for them: "lost all of our skilled set-up people to [another company];" "We are surrounded by Civil Service wanting same skills - very difficult;" "There is one local company that fills all its requirements from among our best employees."

Twelve percent of the companies that have experienced pirating say they have not coped with the problem as yet, 16 percent say they merely recruit and train replacements, and another 16 percent do not say how they are handling the problem. The majority, however, have taken some action to stop it.

Twenty-seven percent of the firms that have had some pirating say they handle the problem by increasing salaries and wages. Their comments include: "merit increases help - especially for EDP;" "attempt to be more competitive with the pirates in salaries, benefits, conditions and opportunities;" "try to be above average in compensation;" "compared wage structure with other firms' to see where we had to make adjustments."

An executive from one of the smaller firms, while stating that his company is continually reviewing wages, notes that the firm tries to avoid a wage spiral in preventing piracy:

> . . . Continual review of competitive position; i.e., wage, salaries and fringe benefits. Everyone is bound to lose some employees to offers above the market. We try to avoid getting on this type merry-go-round. We accept, as others do, a nominal amount of piracy from friend and foe.--Director of Industrial Relations, Smaller Company.

A general analysis of why the pirating occurred is conducted by 18 percent of the companies that have a pirating problem. Comments from this group include: "increased challenge and opportunity;" "make sure house is in order - stick with it;" "try to improve conditions for those remaining."

A "gentlemen's agreement" with the personnel director of the pirate firm is the approach used by 10 percent of the companies with a pirating problem. Here are some comments from personnel executives who have done this:

> Talked with competitor and asked him to limit his proselyting.--John E. Bryan, Director of Industrial Relations, Albemarle Paper Co., Richmond, Va.

> Talk with company officials. Notify company when someone applies from that company, unless applicant specifies otherwise.--G. A. Okerlund, Personnel Manager and Safety Director, Georgia-Pacific, Bellingham, Wash.

Counter-hiring against the pirate is a means of coping with the problem for 6 percent of the companies. One executive calls this the "most effective curb" for pirating. Another company used this measure to bring about an agreement with pirating firms:

> Piracy was practiced by two competing firms. We attempted but failed to reach an amenable agreement, after which we pirated their employees. We then reached an agreement we'd not employ each other's active people, but use a system of cross referrals of applicants.--Industrial Relations Manager, Smaller Company.

Other ways of handling the pirating problem are mentioned by two of the Forum executives:

> In many cases, pirated employees have asked to return to us. We make a big thing of this.--G. S. Anderson, Vice President, Personnel, Burris Manufacturing Co., Lincolnton, N. C.

> Discussion and close contact with employees to retain them.--James F. Greene, Director of Industrial Relations, Farrington Electronics, Inc., Springfield, Va.

PROBLEMS IN ACCOMPLISHING PROPER UTILIZATION

Job Changes

Job changes have been made in the interest of improvement or mechanization by 88 percent of all the Forum companies - 92 percent of the larger ones and 80 percent of the smaller firms.

Before the change, what steps did these companies take, in order to prevent or alleviate possible union opposition or opposition from individual employees? The majority - 82 percent of the companies that made changes - report that preventive action was in the form of communications. Some brief comments on this step are: "face-to-face review with all concerned;" "meetings with union and then employees concerned;" "frank discussion well in advance;" "asked union for suggestions and help in making change;" "forthright explanation of management decisions to union." More detailed examples of how companies use communications to forestall problems in making job changes are:

> Proceed on basis that it is assumed everyone agrees steps must be taken regularly by the company to make for a more efficient operation. Consistently handle those "hurt" fairly and as individuals.--Wayne R. Stone, Director of Industrial Relations, Atlas Press Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.

> On recent job changes, we approached the union and the workers affected as early as possible, explaining the necessary changes. We asked for suggestions and received excellent cooperation. We incorporated union ideas wherever practical and kept the union aware of all actions and changes in plans. Installations were made and naturally unexpected problems arose. These were handled in the same manner as were pre-change problems. We are not compelled to use this approach. However, we feel it's a proper, equitable, mature method that has proven successful.--James R. Clark, Industrial Relations Manager, McCreary Tire and Rubber Co., Indiana, Pa.

> Long lead time, firm management position, early cooperation sought from union in explaining methodical changes to employees.--E. P. Dupras, Manager, Industrial Relations Administration, AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

Transferring employees affected by job changes is a step taken by 18 percent of the companies before making changes. A few of these companies say they try to transfer the employees into higher positions. Comments on transfers before job changes are made include:

> In all cases so far the employee has been elevated to the higher skill position.--Personnel Manager, Larger Company.

> [Problems are prevented] by anticipating opposition and transferring men as openings exist in other job classifications. For instance, we installed a new automatic car wash system which requires no labor, where previously two men were utilized full time. We received no problems since it was not an overnight change.--General Manager, Larger Company.

One company, while computerizing its operations, increases the responsibility of employees affected by the job changes:

> We make an effort to keep our home office force constant but make our present jobs more meaningful to our employees by increasing the responsibility of these jobs as we put more and more of the routine work on the computer. This allows us to process more work and to help our employees grow, without actually eliminating any of our present employees.--John T. Acree, III, Vice President, Lincoln Income Life Insurance Co., Louisville, Ky.

Contractual arrangements are followed by 9 percent of the companies prior to making job changes, as a step for preventing or alleviating opposition. For some of these companies this means negotiation. One executive says his company tries to "keep contract language to allow for change," and another reports that the labor agreement contains a provision for a reduction in the work force. Termination allowances, as provided in the contract, are given to displaced employees, one of the larger companies reports.

Five percent of the companies retrain employees involved, before making job changes. Other steps mentioned as ones taken prior to job changes in order to prevent or alleviate problems are: "protect present wage rates," and "involve those people whose jobs will be affected by enlisting them to help solve problems."

One Panel member remarks that his company does not take any positive action before job changes are made and "that's the problem." Another member notes that job change "has been a slow process and we have tried to let turnover take care of extra help."

Nearly half of the companies that made job changes encountered problems afterwards. How were these problems handled? Communications were used by 21 percent of the companies. Executives make

these comments on communications as a means of solving problems resulting from job changes: "mutual discussion solved all problems;" "a thorough explanation has been well received;" and "despite advance warning, never really convince that change is necessary - must follow up repeatedly."

Nineteen percent of the companies that had problems after job changes were made report that training or retraining was necessary. A few of these companies say they ran into problems with training itself, but indicate that they followed through on this course: "provided additional training;" "continued on-the-job training;" "some training problems, but each change resulted in a better job." "Time lost in training or retraining is the major problem" for one of the larger companies.

Fourteen percent of the companies that encountered problems after making job changes say they handled each one individually. Their remarks include: "usual resistance and approaches specific to the situation;" "transferred employee who objected;" "continued effort to find proper placement."

Contractual solutions to problems arising after job changes were made are mentioned by 12 percent of the Forum members. Among their comments are: "covered by contract;" "union arbitrated - company sustained;" "handled through grievance procedure - occasionally arbitration."

Ten percent of the companies that had problems after job changes were made say the difficulties involved pay rates. "Handled by negotiation;" "usually adjusted;" and "change rates at union and employees' requests" are some of the comments from this group.

Some of the companies' problems and solutions do not fall into any general category:

> Resistance normally is encountered, particularly if there's added work and same pay. Time alone usually brings solution.--R. D. Patton, Industrial Relations Manager, O'Keefe & Merritt Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

> Restriction of production - [handled by] discipline.--B. F. Johnson, Director of Industrial Relations, Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph, Mich.

Other companies describe problems they have encountered, but do not specify how they handled them:

> Resistant to new department and resentment from new co-workers.--Jean Head Sisco, Vice President, Personnel, Woodward & Lothrop, Inc., Washington, D. C.

> Fought union featherbedding.--John B. O'Brian, Director of Industrial Relations, Leonard Refineries, Inc., Alma, Mich.

Two executives from larger Forum companies make the following observations about job changes in general:

> This whole question focuses on the disparity between productivity and wage increases and the resultant inflation. Large investments in productivity-improving equipment are to a degree frustrated by featherbedding. It is time that the labor statesmen reassessed the role of the union and ... rapidly advancing wages and ... eroding management's right to manage. If this can't be done at a time of full employment, we must face the prospect of runaway inflation.--D. A. Bunce, Assistant Director of Personnel, Hercules Inc., Wilmington, Del.

> When a company such as ours is experiencing continued, regular growth, the problems of efficient manpower utilization are reduced. We have frequently put in new installations which require perhaps only one half the manpower of the old, yet with growth we have been able to provide, without exception, jobs in other areas for those displaced. We once wrote a newsletter which said, in effect, "after ten years of spending millions of dollars for labor-saving equipment, our employment has doubled."--W. C. Stonehouse, Jr., Vice President, Industrial Relations, Latrobe Steel, Co., Latrobe, Pa.

Contract Provisions Affecting Utilization

Slightly less than three fifths of the Forum companies that have a union contract state that there are provisions in it that significantly hinder effective utilization of manpower. Sixty-four percent of the smaller firms and 54 percent of the larger ones mention contract provisions that hinder proper utilization.

Below is a table showing the major types of provisions that are named as hindering effective utilization: seniority factor, rigid job description, and lack of freedom to shift manpower. The "other" category includes many items that do not fall into sizeable percentage groups. Examples of contract provisions under "other" are: "restrictive interpretation on pay and fringes for part-timers;" "size and makeup of groups by contract terms;" "no strike clause in contract;" "must hire overly qualified for unskilled jobs;" and "layoff procedure is cumbersome and costly." One Panel member states that "most clauses are designed to restrict management's flexibility in the utilization of personnel."

Contract Provisions that Hinder Utilization*

	Seniority Factor	Rigid Job Description	Lack of Freedom to Shift Manpower	Other
Larger Companies	60%	16%	16%	32%
Smaller Companies	69	38	0	19
All Companies	63	24	10	27

* Percentages are based on those companies that report having union contracts that contain hindrances to manpower utilization.

Ways in Which Union Aids Effective Utilization

Are there any ways in which the union helps in working for effective utilization of manpower? Of the seven out of ten Forum companies that have a union, 51 percent state that their union does not help in any way in achieving effective utilization of manpower. However, it is interesting to note that a gap of 20 percentage points exists between the percentage of larger and smaller companies that say the union does not help in this area at all. Following is a percentage breakdown of whether companies with unions consider the union helpful in working for effective utilization of manpower:

Union as a Help in Working For Effective Utilization*

	Yes	No	Blank
Larger Companies	44%	44%	13%
Smaller Companies	28	64	8
All Companies	38	51	11

* Percentages do not add up to 100 in all cases, due to rounding.

Comments from executives that report no help from their union in working for effective utilization include the following: "none specifically;" "none that I've ever encountered;" "not particularly - if anything a hindrance;" "ours don't;" and "not yet." An executive for a smaller company declares that lack of help in this area is "one of the greatest weaknesses of modern unions." Two executives from smaller companies explain why they consider the union as working against effective utilization of manpower:

> The union continuously tries to circumscribe jobs and limit jobs to certain duties. Then they want management to hire more employees so they can have more dues-paying members.--Director of Industrial Relations, Smaller Company.

> Generally they oppose changes. We have been successful in negotiating changes to improve utilization in recent labor agreements.--Kent J. Jorgensen, Personnel and Industrial Relations Supervisor, American Gilsonite Co., Gilsonite, Colo.

Among the executives designating the union helpful in achieving effective utilization are a number who indicate that the help is limited: "in some cases;" "only in forcing better communications;" not too many ways - exception is group incentive program;" and "only by verbal suggestions occasionally."

Other Panel members are more positive about the union as a help in working for better manpower utilization:

> Calms rank and file objection; points out characteristics that may make individual unsuited for new job.--Charles D. Cole, Secretary & Corporate Counsel, Toledo Scale Co., Toledo, Ohio.

Perhaps the greatest asset of union is the leverage on supervisors, who must prove their case in merit increases, promotion, etc. Thus they maintain and establish fairer work standards and production records.--Jean Head Sisco, Vice President, Personnel, Woodward & Lothrop, Inc., Washington, D. C.

[Union helps] by excellent cooperation and understanding.--James R. Clark, Industrial Relations Manager, McCreary Tire and Rubber Co., Indiana, Pa.

Detailed explanation of need for modernization and streamlining work force for increased profits.--E. P. Dupras, Manager, Industrial Relations Administration, AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

Effect pressure in beneficial ways.--Personnel Manager, Larger Company.

Cooperates in temporary transfer of employees and in adjustment of labor force in ways consistent with both letter and spirit of contract.--G. L. Shott, Manager, Personnel Relations. Johnson & Johnson, Midwestern Surgical Dressings Plant, Chicago, Ill.

Cooperation in training programs, standards, job evaluation.--J. Robert Fryer, Director of Industrial Relations, Leesona Corp., Warwick, R. I.

They meet with company supervisors each week to determine manpower needs based on an accepted manning table.--Industrial Relations Counsel, Larger Company.

Many times they are able to "sell" a transfer where management is failing.--Labor Relations Manager, Larger Company.

Union helps in proper placement of employees with medical and performance problems.--W. R. Wortham, Industrial Relations Manager, Trane Co., Dunmore, Pa.

While they do not credit the union organization as a help in working for effective manpower utilization, executives from two of the larger Forum companies note that some individuals within the union have been helpful in this matter:

> Not necessarily the union, but responsible union officers and stewards have reacted favorably in cooperating with the company in given situations.--Director of Personnel, Larger Company.

> Not generally [helpful]. However, in some instances certain representatives have been quite helpful. Some have actually helped to convince employees that crew reductions, for example, were proper and in order. Some have helped break up slowdowns. Some have made good and beneficial suggestions resulting in more effective utilization of manpower, etc. Unfortunately, this type of representative has been in the minority.--Industrial Relations Director, Larger Company.

MARYLAND – *Eugene R. Callahan,* Defense Electronics, Inc., Rockville; *Paul R. Fitez,* Fairchild Hiller Corp., Germantown; *Douglas Macnab,* Koppers Co., Inc., Baltimore; *J. H. McCulley,* Symington Wayne Corp., Salisbury; *Richard L. Roche,* Cambridge Wire Cloth Co., Cambridge.

MISSISSIPPI – *H. C. Johnson,* American Bosch Arma Corp., Columbus.

NORTH CAROLINA – *G. S. Anderson,* Burris Mfg. Co., Inc., Lincolnton; *Richard S. Buse,* Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Shelby; *Russell J. Ehrhardt,* McLean Trucking Co., Winston-Salem; *W. L. Entz,* General Telephone Co. of the Southeast, Durham; *Haven H. Newton,* Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray; *Carroll Thomas,* Concrete Materials, Inc., Charlotte.

OKLAHOMA – *J. R. Hodges,* Robberson Steel Co., Oklahoma City; *W. H. Van Natter,* Hillcrest Medical Center, Tulsa; *J. C. Williams,* North American Aviation, Inc., Tulsa.

PUERTO RICO – *Victor Luis Lleras,* Puerto Rico Land Authority, Santurce; *A. C. McCurdy,* Commonwealth Oil Refining Co., Inc., San Juan.

SOUTH CAROLINA – *R. E. Russell,* SCM Corp., Orangeburg; *M. B. Wallace, Jr.,* E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., Inc., Florence; *N. E. Williams,* Pacific Columbia Mills, Columbia.

TENNESSEE – *Lee Binkley,* Genesco, Nashville; *James A. Disney,* Dempster Brothers, Inc., Knoxville; *C. E. Fritschle,* Kingsport Press, Inc., Kingsport; *J. F. Handly,* National Life & Accident Insurance Co., Nashville; *Frank Miles,* E. L. Bruce Co., Inc., Memphis; *Francis B. Veal, Jr.,* American Can Co., Shelbyville.

TEXAS – *M. Lee Bishop,* Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Dallas; *Miss Mary Frances Boothe,* City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Texas, San Antonio; *Dan E. Butt,* H. E. Butt Grocery Co., Corpus Christi; *M. W. Frashuer,* Houston Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Houston; *R. V. Gillispie,* Gulf States Tube Corp., Rosenberg; *Joseph J. Halbach,* Texas Instruments, Inc., Dallas; *L. Wilson Hervey,* Gary Aircraft Corp., San Antonio; *Eric M. Hilton,* The Shamrock Hilton Hotel, Houston; *Fred Manasco,* Gifford-Hill Co., Inc., Dallas; *John L. Miller,* Schill Steel Co., Houston; *Joseph A. Moran,* Varo, Inc., Garland; *E. L. Ogden,* Anderson, Clayton & Co., Inc., Houston.

VIRGINIA – *John E. Bryan, Jr.,* Albemarle Paper Co., Richmond; *James F. Greene,* Farrington Business Machines Corp., Springfield; *John R. Larew,* Appalachian Power Co., Roanoke; *H. W. Larrabee,* American Machine & Foundry Co., Richmond; *C. W. Myers,* Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News; *L. W. Pasker,* Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond; *H. McD. Williams,* Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp., Norfolk; *T. L. Wood,* Melpar, Inc., Falls Church.

WEST VIRGINIA – *P. W. Gregory,* Union Carbide Corp., South Charleston.

CENTRAL STATES

ILLINOIS – *E. R. Clarke,* Fansteel Metallurgical Corp., North Chicago; *C. E. Coffin,* Mueller Co., Decatur; *F. E. Greco,* Wedron Silica Co., Chicago; *Roy T. Hardy,* Barber-Colman Co., Rockford; *Albert D. Henderson,* The Griffith Laboratories, Inc., Chicago; *G. W. Holder,* Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago; *W. D. Holloway,* Laidlaw Wire Co., Peoria; *J. F. Hucker,* Griffin Wheel Co., Chicago; *T. J. Jack,* Packaging Corp. of America, Evanston; *Blaine Kincaid,* American Colloid Co., Skokie; *Miss Dorothy King,* Henry C. Lytton & Co., Chicago; *A. E. Langenbach,* First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago; *S. M. Lyman,* Deere & Co., Moline; *Paul B. Musgrove,* Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Peoria; *Edward Newmes,* Little Company of Mary Hospital, Evergreen Park; *Hal Schleitwiler,* The Cuneo Press, Chicago; *Gerald L. Shott,* Johnson & Johnson, Chicago; *G. H. Smith,* Turner Mfg. Co., Chicago; *George A. Taylor,* International Minerals & Chemical Corp., Skokie.

INDIANA – *Michael C. Granat,* Drewrys Limited U.S.A., Inc., South Bend; *W. H. Hathaway,* Northern Indiana Public Service Co., Hammond; *G. T. Gallagher,* Studebaker Corp., South Bend; *Clinton J. Frank, Jr.,* Hamilton-Cosco, Inc., Columbus; *R. G. Sherman,* Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Inc., Indianapolis; *G. J. Grimmer,* Keyes Fibre Co., Hammond.

IOWA – *W. J. Schiltz,* E. W. Bliss Co., Davenport.

MICHIGAN – *William J. Bingham, Jr.,* National Bank of Detroit, Detroit; *R. C. Bretting,* Consumers Power Co., Jackson; *A. W. Darling,* Kent-Moore Corp., Warren; *A. G. Denison,* Parke Davis & Co., Detroit; *B. F. Johnson,* Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph; *Miss Josephine Karmazin,* Karmazin Products Corp., Wyandotte; *James B. McKeon,* DSI Corp., Plymouth; *Harold Meier,* Universal Electric Co., Owosso; *Blake I. Mohney,* Hoover Ball & Bearing Co., Ann Arbor; *Thomas J. Murphy,* Control Data Corp., Rochester; *John B. O'Brien,* Leonard Refineries, Inc., Alma; *W. G. Raven,* Continental Motors Corp., Muskegon; *Wayne R. Stone,* Atlas Press Co., Kalamazoo.

MINNESOTA – *George R. Bloom,* Red Owl Stores, Inc., Minneapolis; *Kenneth M. Hall,* G. H. Tennant Co., Minneapolis; *J. R. Savage,* Wood Conversion Co., St. Paul; *C. F. Tourek,* 3M Co., St. Paul.

MISSOURI – *George J. Malmos,* McGraw-Hill, Inc., Manchester.

OHIO – *Edward C. Arthur,* The Ohio Art Co., Bryan; *Gordon B. Cameron,* The Lubrizol Corp., Cleveland; *Charles D. Cole,* Toledo Scale Corp., Toledo; *Stanley R. Dunlap,* The W. S. Tyler Co., Inc., Cleveland; *Phillip B. Harrity,* The Hoover Co., North Canton; *J. A. Kilo,* The Ferry Cap & Set Screw Co., Cleveland; *K. F. Krieg,* The Philip Carey Mfg. Co., Cincinnati; *Donald P. Lacker,* The First National Bank of Cincinnati, Cincinnati; *Edward F. Lannigan,* Reliance Electric & Engineering Co., Cleveland; *Theodore A. Lazar,* Lancaster Colony Corp., Columbus; *A. C. Lyon,* Foote Mineral Co., Cambridge; *Paul Matas,* Sun Corp., Barberton; *Thomas J. Raleigh,* Dana Corp., Toledo; *Paul V. Rosenberger,* The General Tire & Rubber Co., Akron; *Charles F. Seitz,* Koehring Co., Lorain; *B. Lyle Shafer,* National Cash Register Co., Dayton; *Richard L. Sutton,* The Jaeger Machine Co., Columbus; *Peter Uglesich,* Hewitt-Robins, Inc., Cincinnati; *E. R. Willemin,* Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co., Elyria; *W. J. Zook,* The Wooster Brush Co., Wooster.

WISCONSIN – *Jack F. Schuhman,* The T. L. Smith Co., Milwaukee; *Frederic R. Schulz,* Kelley Co., Inc., Milwaukee; *Stanley G. Springer,* J. I. Case Co., Racine.

WESTERN STATES

ARIZONA – *Randal Littleton,* ITT Cannon Electric, Phoenix; *Dick Loy,* Cudahy Co., Phoenix; *Frank Welch, Jr.,* The Anaconda Company, Sahuarita.

CALIFORNIA – *W. L. Babecky,* Babcock Electronics Corp., Costa Mesa; *D. Monte Brower,* The Northwest Paper Co., Pomona; *Henry Bueker,* Stainless Steel Products, Inc., Burbank; *J. G. Collins,* Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; *N. Eskelson,* California-Pacific Utilities, San Francisco; *Edwin B. Gilroy,* VSI Corp., Pasadena; *John J. Link,* Electronic Memories, Inc., Hawthorne; *Virgil O. McCollum,* U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp., Los Angeles; *Frank P. Melograno,* The Bunker-Ramo Corp., Canoga Park; *Frank J. Neary,* Purex Corp., Ltd., Lakewood; *Maxwell E. Nelson,* San Diego Gas & Electric Co., San Diego; *Ray Patton,* O'Keefe & Merritt Co., Los Angeles; *George F. Phillips,* White Motor Corp., Torrance; *R. J. Pinsker,* Raychem Corp., Redwood City; *James T. Rasbury,* Signal Oil & Gas Co., Los Angeles; *R. H. Rogers,* Challenge-Cook Bros., Inc., Industry; *John M. Ryan,* Utah Construction & Mining Co., San Francisco; *A. E. Spina,* Tri-Valley Growers, San Francisco; *M. C. Strittmatter,* Rexall Drug & Chemical Co., Los Angeles; *Eugene W. Wooten,* Max Factor & Co., Hollywood.

COLORADO – *Kent J. Jorgensen,* American Gilsonite Co., Gilsonite; *R. L. Shavlik,* Ball Brothers Research Corp., Boulder; *Jerry C. Wilson,* Yellow Cab, Inc., Denver.

HAWAII – *Don Nicholson,* AMFAC, Inc., Honolulu; *Yoshiharu Nishida,* Hawaiian Telephone Co., Honolulu.

NEVADA – *C. E. Naugle,* EG&G, Inc., Las Vegas.

OREGON – *Richard L. Hullinger,* Ford Industries, Inc., Portland.

WASHINGTON – *R. C. Friede,* Weisfield's, Inc., Seattle; *G. A. Okerlund,* Georgia-Pacific Corp., Bellingham; *Neil K. Smith,* Seattle First National Bank, Seattle.

WYOMING – *R. N. Dyer,* FMC Corp., Green River.

PERSONNEL POLICIES FORUM SURVEYS IN PRINT

7. Christmas and Year-End Personnel Problems, October 1951
11. Executive Development, May 1952
12. Building Employee Morale, July 1952
13. Choosing Better Foremen, August 1952
15. Communications to Employees, November 1952
16. Fringe Benefits for Supervisors, January 1953
17. The Personnel-Industrial Relations Function, March 1953
20. The Older Worker, October 1953
21. Administration of Pension Plans, November 1953
22. Earnings of First-Line Supervisors, January 1954
23. Evaluating a Personnel-Industrial Relations Program, February 1954
24. Employment Stabilization, April 1954
25. Administration of Health and Welfare Plans, July 1954
26. Control of Absenteeism, September 1954
27. Computing Absenteeism Rates, October 1954
28. Wage-Salary Administration, November 1954
29. Company Safety Programs, February 1955
30. Unemployment Compensation Problems, May 1955
31. Supervisory Development: Part 1, July 1955
32. Supervisory Development: Part 2, September 1955
33. Automation, November 1955
34. Nonsupervisory Office Employees, December 1955
35. Downward Communications, February 1956
36. Military Leave Policies, May 1956
37. The Executive, July 1956
38. Medical Services for Employees, August 1956
39. Professional Employees, October 1956
40. Job Evaluation, December 1956
42. Disciplinary Practices and Policies, July 1957
43. Employee Job Satisfaction, September 1957
44. Company Aid to Education, October 1957
45. Executive Compensation, December 1957
46. Company Experiences With Automation, January 1958
47. Status of First-Line Supervisors, July 1958
48. Supervisory Selection Procedures, September 1958
49. Grievance Procedures for Unorganized Employees, October 1958
50. Raising Employee Productivity, December 1958
51. Tools of the Personnel Profession, February 1959
52. The Personnel-Industrial Relations Function, April 1959
54. Controlling Health & Welfare Costs, October 1959
56. Wage Policies in an Inflationary Period, March 1960
57. Controlling Absenteeism, June 1960
59. Retirement Policies, December 1960
60. Orientation of New Employees, April 1961
61. Industrial Health Programs, July 1961
62. Solving the Shortage of Specialized Personnel, September 1961
63. Employee Counseling, November 1961
64. Can Unfavorable Employee Attitudes be Changed? December 1961
65. Military Leave Practices, March 1962
66. Training Rank & File Employees, July 1962
67. Plant Safety, October 1962
68. Recognition of Service & Performance, December 1962
69. Practices for White-Collar Employees, May 1963
70. Employee Selection Procedures, July 1963
72. Management Trainee Programs, December 1963
73. The Personnel Department, June 1964
74. Managerial Appraisal Programs, September 1964
75. Impact of the Equal Pay Act, November 1964
77. The Negro & Title VII, July 1965
78. Training First-Line Supervisors, February 1966
80. Sex & Title VII, April 1967
81. Executive Development, September 1967
82. A Current Look at: (1) The Negro & Title VII,
(2) Sex & Title VII, December 1967
83. Effective Utilization of Manpower, August 1968

All Survey Reports are priced at $2 per copy.